



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,128	07/10/2001	Ryan Shillington	M-11705 US	7988
33438	7590	09/06/2006	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP P.O. BOX 203518 AUSTIN, TX 78720			WILSON, YOLANDA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/902,128

Applicant(s)

SHILLINGTON ET AL.

Examiner

Yolanda L. Wilson

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (USPN 6026362A) in view of Spertus et al. (USPN 6938245B1) in further view of Foote et al. (USPN 6167535A). As appears in claims 1,7, 8,17, Kim et al. discloses invoking the application program and the debugger program from the workstation via a network interface to cause the server to execute the application program and the debugger program in column 10, lines 33-46.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state executing a web browser at the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to execute a web browser at the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to execute a web browser at the workstation because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state using a user interface provided by the web browser to invoke the application program and the debugger program.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a user interface provided by the web browser to invoke the application program and the debugger program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a user interface provided by the web browser to invoke the application program and the debugger program because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging regardless of location of the debugged system.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state displaying a debug view option in the web browser at the workstation for generating a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; receiving the second web page from the server for displaying the debug frame in the web browser at the workstation when the debug view option is selected; and displaying the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display a debug view option in the web browser at the workstation for generating a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; receiving the second web page from the server for displaying the debug frame in the web browser at the workstation when the debug view option is selected; and displaying the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the

workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to display a debug view option in the web browser at the workstation for generating a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; receiving the second web page from the server for displaying the debug frame in the web browser at the workstation when the debug view option is selected; and displaying the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

Kim et al. and Spertus et al. fail to explicitly state receiving a first web page from the server for displaying a user frame in the web browser at the workstation; displaying the user frame of the first web page in the web browser at the workstation, wherein the user frame includes information generated by the application program.

Foote et al. discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 45-56.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive a first web page from the server for displaying a user frame in the web browser at the workstation; displaying the user frame of the first web page in the web browser at the workstation, wherein the user frame includes information generated by the application program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to receive a first web page from the server for displaying a user frame in the web browser at the workstation; displaying the user frame of the first

web page in the web browser at the workstation, wherein the user frame includes information generated by the application program because the web browser allows for the program and its components to be seen.

3. As per claims 2 and 18, Kim et al. discloses providing a user view option at the workstation for generating the user frame and displaying the user frame when the user view option is selected in column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

4. As per claims 3,19, Kim et al. discloses displaying the debug frame at the workstation includes providing a list of variable names in the application program in column 14, lines 51-57; column 15, lines 10-31

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state displaying the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to display the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

5. As per claim 4, Kim et al. discloses displaying the debug frame at the workstation includes providing at least one of: a list of request information variable names in the

application program or a list of session information variable names in the application program in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state displaying the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to display the debug frame of the second web page in the web browser at the workstation because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

6. As per claim 5, Kim et al. discloses wherein one or more of the variable names represents a corresponding object, the method further comprising: selecting one of the variable names; and providing information about the object corresponding to the variable name on the debug frame in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

7. As per claim 6, Kim et al. discloses wherein the information about the object includes at least one of: the fields of the object, the methods associated with the object or the constructors associated with the object in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

8. As per claims 9, 15,16,21, Kim et al. discloses executing the application program and the debugger program on the server when the application program is invoked from the workstation in column 10, lines 33-46.

Kim et al. and Spertus et al. fail to explicitly generating information for a first web page wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program; transmitting the first web page to the workstation.

Foote et al. discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 45-56.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for a first web page wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for a first web page wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program because the web browser allows for the program and its components to be seen.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generating information for a second web page wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program; and transmitting the second web page to the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.



Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for a second web page wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program; and transmitting the second web page to the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for a second web page wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program; and transmitting the second web page to the workstation because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

9. As per claims 10 and 22, Kim et al. discloses wherein generating information for the debug frame includes saving the information for the user frame when the debug view option is selected in column 10, lines 40-46 and column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generating information for second web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for second web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for second

web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

10. As per claims 11 and 23, Kim et al. discloses restoring the saved information for the user frame when a user view option is selected at the workstation in column 10, lines 40-46 and column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

11. As per claim 12, Kim et al. discloses generating information for the debug frame includes generating a list of components of the application program in column 14, 51-57; column 15, lines 10-31.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generating information for the second web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for second web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for second web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

12. As per claim 13, Kim et al. discloses wherein generating information for the debug frame includes generating at least one of: a list of variables in the application program, a list of methods associated with one or more of the variables in the application program, or a list of constructors with one or more of the variables in the application program in column 4, line 50 – column 5, line 7.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generating information for the second web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for second web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for second web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

13. As per claim 14, Kim et al. discloses wherein generating information for the debug frame includes using reflection technology to generate at least one of: a list of variables in the application program, a list of methods associated with one or more of the variables, and a list of constructors associated with one or more of the variables in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generating information for the second web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for second web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for second web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

14. As per claim 20, Kim et al. discloses means for presenting information about the selected object, wherein the information about the object includes at least one of: the

Art Unit: 2113

name of the object, the fields of the object, the methods associated with the object, or the constructors associated with the object in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

15. As per claim 22, Kim et al. discloses means for saving the information for the user frame when the debug view option is selected in column 10, lines 40-46 and column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generating information for second web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for second web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for second web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

16. As per claim 24, Kim et al. discloses means for generating a list of objects in the application program in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

17. As per claim 25, Kim et al. discloses wherein means for generating a list of objects in the application program includes at least one of: a list of methods associated with one or more of the objects in the application program, or a list of constructors with one or more of the objects in the application program in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

18. As per claim 26, Kim et al. discloses wherein the means for using reflection technology to generate at least one of: a list of objects in the application program, a list of methods associated with one or more of the objects, and a list of constructors associated with one or more of the objects in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

19. As per claim 27, Kim et al. discloses means for providing the list of objects to the workstation in a web page when the debug view option is selected at the workstation in column 14, line 51 – column 15, line 6; column 8, lines 24-36.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state providing the list of objects in a web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the list of objects in a web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the list of objects in a web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

20. As per claim 28, Kim et al. discloses means for providing in a web page at least one of: a list of names of the objects, a list of fields of at least one of the objects, a list of values of at least one of the objects, the list of methods associated with at least one of the objects in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state providing a web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a web page because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

21. As per claim 29, Kim et al. discloses allow a user to invoke the application program and the debugger program from the workstation to cause the server to execute the application program and the debugger program in column 10, lines 33-46.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state executing a web browser at the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to execute a web browser at the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to execute a web browser at the workstation because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state interact with a web page displayed by the web browser to invoke the application program and the debugger program.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to interact with a web page displayed by the web browser to invoke the application program and the debugger program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to interact with a web page displayed by the web

browser to invoke the application program and the debugger program because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging regardless of location of the debugged system.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state present a debug view option to generate a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; and present the debug frame of the second web page when the debug view option is selected wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to present a debug view option to generate a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; and present the debug frame of the second web page when the debug view option is selected wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to present a debug view option to generate a second web page having a debug frame of the application program; and present the debug frame of the second web page when the debug view option is selected wherein the debug frame includes information about one or more components of the application program because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

Art Unit: 2113

Kim et al. and Spertus et al. fail to explicitly state present a first web page in the web browser wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program.

Footnote et al. discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 45-56.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to present a first web page in the web browser wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to present a first web page in the web browser wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program because the web browser allows for the program and its components to be seen.

22. As per claim 30, Kim et al. discloses present a user view option at the workstation and present the user frame when the user view option is selected in column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state web browser executable at the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a web browser executable at the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a web browser executable at the workstation because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.



Art Unit: 2113

23. As per claim 31, Kim et al. discloses the debug frame at the workstation includes a list of one or more components of the application program in column 14, 51-57; column 15, lines 10-31.

24. As per claims 32,42, Kim et al. fails to explicitly state the application program generates instructions and information for displaying the web pages.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the application program generate instructions and information for displaying the web pages. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the application program generates instructions and information for displaying the web pages because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.

25. As per claim 33, Kim et al. discloses wherein the web browser is operable to display graphical user controls to allow the workstation to communicate with the server.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the web browser be operable to display graphical user controls to allow the workstation to communicate with the server. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the web browser be operable to display graphical user controls to allow the workstation to communicate with the server because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.

26. As per claim 34, Kim et al. discloses wherein the web browser is operable to present a third web page and the third web page comprises additional information about at least one of the components when the component is selected by the user in column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

27. As per claim 35, Kim et al. discloses wherein the additional information includes at least one of: the name of the component, the fields of the component, the methods associated with the component, or the constructors associated with the component in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

28. As per claim 36, Kim et al. discloses means for executing the application program and the debugger program on the server when the application program is invoked from the workstation in column 10, lines 33-46.

Kim et al. and Spertus et al. fail to explicitly means for generating information for a first web page wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program; transmitting the first web page to the workstation.

Foote et al. discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 45-56.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate information for a first web page wherein the first web page comprises a user frame that includes information generated by the application program. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate information for a first web page wherein the first web page comprises a user

frame that includes information generated by the application program because the web browser allows for the program and its components to be seen.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state a debugger program operation to generate information for a second web page wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program; and transmitting the second web page to the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-58; column 10, lines 16-31.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a debugger program operation to generate information for a second web page wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program; and transmitting the second web page to the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a debugger program operation to generate information for a second web page wherein the second web page comprises a debug frame when a debug view option is selected from the workstation wherein the debug frame includes information about components of the application program; and transmitting the second web page to the workstation because the web browser allows for a user to view information concerning the program debugged.

29. As per claim 37, Kim et al. discloses wherein the debugger program is operable to save the information for the user frame when the debug view option is selected in column 10, lines 40-46 and column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

30. As per claim 38, Kim et al. discloses wherein the debugger program is operable to restore the saved information for the user frame when a user view option is selected at the workstation in column 10, lines 40-46 and column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 4.

31. As per claim 39, Kim et al. discloses wherein the debugger program is operable to generate a list of objects of the application program in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

32. As per claim 40, Kim et al. discloses wherein the debugger program is operable to generate at least one of: a list of methods associated with one or more of the variables in the application program, or a list of constructors with one or more of the variables in the application program in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

Kim et al. fails to explicitly state generate in a web page.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made generate in a web page. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate in a web page because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.

33. As per claim 41, Kim et al. discloses wherein the debugger program is operable to use reflection technology to generate at least one of: a list of objects in the application program, a list of methods associated with one or more of the objects, and a

Art Unit: 2113

list of constructors associated with one or more of the objects in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36.

34. As per claim 43, Kim et al. discloses the server is operable to communicate with a web browser program at the workstation.

Spertus et al. discloses this limitation in column 2, lines 46-48.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the server be operable to communicate with a web browser program at the workstation. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the server be operable to communicate with a web browser program at the workstation because the web browser allows for interaction during debugging.

35. As per claim 44, Kim et al. discloses the application program accesses at least one of internal code, private code, or public code in column 15, lines 1-6; column 8, lines 24-36

### ***Response to Arguments***

36. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new references, as indicated above, have been used to reject the new added limitations in the above claims.

### ***Conclusion***

37. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda L. Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yolanda L Wilson  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2113

ylw

  
ROBERT W. BRUNS  
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100